

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHAEL GRESHAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES SCHIEBNER et al.,

Defendants.

File No. 1:16-CV-394

HON. GORDON J. QUIST

ORDER

On February 8, 2017, United States Magistrate Judge Ray Kent issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), recommending that Defendants’ pending motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 40, 47, 63) be granted, that the remaining Defendants be dismissed, and that the other motions in this action be denied as moot. (ECF No. 83.) Before the Court are Plaintiff’s objections to the R&R. (ECF No. 84.)

This Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of a R&R to which specific objections are made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

The Magistrate Judge determined that Plaintiff’s complaint does not comply with the pre-filing restrictions that have been placed on Plaintiff because it alleges claims that arise out of more than one transaction or event. Plaintiff disagrees. He claims that Defendants’ actions are part of a single campaign of harassment towards him, and that they arise out of a single transaction of “forcibly medicating Plaintiff[,], retaliating against him[, and] not providing him with due process at the hearings to forcibly medicate the Plaintiff against his will[.]” (Obj., ECF No. 84,

PageID.295.) Even Plaintiff's description of his complaint describes more than one transaction or event. Thus, the Court agrees that Plaintiff's complaint does not comply with the pre-filing restrictions imposed on him. Consequently, Plaintiff's objections will be denied and the action will be dismissed.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 84) are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 83) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 40, 47, 63) are **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the outstanding motions in this action (ECF Nos. 28, 38, 51, 59, 80) are **DENIED** as moot.

A judgment will be entered that is consistent with this order.

Dated: March 7, 2017

/s/ Gordon J. Quist
GORDON J. QUIST
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE